



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,985	06/15/2001	Michael J. Morton	13768.810.54	9825
47973 7590 03/20/2007 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER ZHOU, TING	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/882,985	MORTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ting Zhou	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 2 January 2007 under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/882,985 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
2. The amendments filed on 2 January 2007, submitted with the filing of the RCE have been received and entered. Claims 1-42 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson et al. US Publication 2002/0129054 (hereinafter "Ferguson") and Khan U.S. Publication 2002/0032611.

Referring to claims 1, 19 and 31, Ferguson teaches a method, computer program product and system comprising an object sending a request to a server and an object receiving a request from the server (the spreadsheet of the client computer communicates with a server via

Art Unit: 2173

requesting and receiving data, i.e. downloading web pages/web content from the server) (Ferguson: page 3, paragraph 0018, page 5, paragraph 0053 and page 16, paragraphs 0164-0169); determining if the server supports a web view page for a particular application object, and upon determining that the server supports a web view page for the particular application object, receiving a web view page from the server (the spreadsheet of the productivity application receives a web view page, i.e. network/internet based operation/functionalities/web pages from the server upon determination that the network/internet functionalities are supported, i.e. requested by the user) (Ferguson: page 4, paragraphs 0044 and 0050-0051, page 5, paragraphs 0053-0054 and page 0016, paragraphs 0164-0169); displaying the web view page within the particular application object (a browser web page is displayed within the productivity application spreadsheet to allow users access to the network/Internet) (Ferguson: page 2, paragraphs 0013-0015 and Figure 11B); receiving user input corresponding to an element within the web view; determining if the element is to be processed by a browser module; and if the element is to be processed by the browser module, then processing the element by the browser module; or if the element is not to be processed by the browser module, then passing appropriate information about the selected element to the object (users interact with the spreadsheet application, i.e. select information, etc.; the spreadsheet application has dual functionalities, namely the original desktop functionality common to applications and browser based internet functionalities; therefore, users can select the desktop functionalities which will be processed by the application program, or browser based functionalities, which will be received from the server) (Ferguson: page 4, paragraph 0051, page 5, paragraph 0053, page 6, paragraph 0062 and page 16, paragraph 0164-0169). However, although Ferguson teaches the integration of Internet capabilities into a

Art Unit: 2173

displayed box on the interface, Ferguson fails to explicitly teach that the displayed box is a dialog box. Khan teaches a graphical user interface that integrates browser capabilities into an application program (Khan: page 4, claim 1, and Figures 3-4) similar to that of Ferguson. In addition, Khan further teaches integrating Internet capabilities into a dialog box (the explorer view showing executed searches over the internet can be integrated with dialog boxes that provides HTML, i.e. web functionalities) (Khan: page 4, claim 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ferguson and Khan before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface that integrates browser functionalities into a spreadsheet of Ferguson to include the Internet connection via a dialog box taught of Khan, in order to obtain an interface that integrates browser, i.e. Internet/web page capabilities into a dialog box for file management. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the integration of multiple functions into one displayed object allows users to effectively display more information and perform more tasks with less displayed windows, avoiding clustering of the display screen.

Referring to claims 10, 25 and 37, Ferguson teaches a method, computer program product and system comprising receiving by a server a request from an application corresponding to a particular object; the server determining if the server supports a web view page for the particular application object (the spreadsheet of the client computer productivity application communicates with a server via requesting data, i.e. downloading web pages/web content from the server) (Ferguson: page 3, paragraph 0018, page 5, paragraph 0053 and page 16, paragraphs 0164-0169); sending a response to the application, the response comprising one of: upon having determined that the server supports a web view page for the particular

application object, the response comprising a web view page to be displayed by the particular application object; upon having determined that the server does not support a web view page for the particular application object, the response comprising an indication that the particular application object is not supported (the spreadsheet application has dual functionalities, namely the original desktop functionality common to applications and browser based internet functionalities; therefore, users can select the desktop functionalities which will be processed by the application program, or browser based functionalities, which will be received from the server; in other words, if the spreadsheet object requests a webpage from the server, the server can send the webpage to be downloaded by the spreadsheet application) (Ferguson: page 4, paragraph 0051, page 5, paragraph 0053, page 6, paragraph 0062 and page 16, paragraph 0164-0169). However, although Ferguson teaches the integration of Internet capabilities into a displayed box on the interface, Ferguson fails to explicitly teach that the displayed box is a dialog box. Khan teaches a graphical user interface that integrates browser capabilities into an application program (Khan: page 4, claim 1, and Figures 3-4) similar to that of Ferguson. In addition, Khan further teaches integrating Internet capabilities into a dialog box (the explorer view showing executed searches over the internet can be integrated with dialog boxes that provides HTML, i.e. web functionalities) (Khan: page 4, claim 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ferguson and Khan before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface that integrates browser functionalities into a spreadsheet of Ferguson to include the Internet connection via a dialog box taught of Khan, in order to obtain an interface that integrates browser, i.e. Internet/web page capabilities into a dialog box for file management. One would have been motivated to make such a combination

Art Unit: 2173

because the integration of multiple functions into one displayed object allows users to effectively display more information and perform more tasks with less displayed windows, avoiding clustering of the display screen.

Referring to claims 2, 11, 20, 26, 32 and 38, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein the view page corresponds to file management functionality (the GUI displays directories for managing files, as shown by the folder icons on the left-hand side of the display) (Khan: Figures 3-4 and 6).

Referring to claims 3, 13, 21, 27, 33 and 39, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein the element within the web view represents a file (user selection of files shown by the hierarchical folder display) (Khan: page 4, claim 1 and Figures 3-4 and 6).

Referring to claims 4, 22 and 34, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein processing the element comprises saving a file, copying a file, renaming a file, or deleting a file (copying the document, i.e. file) (Ferguson: page 5, paragraph 0052).

Referring to claims 5, 14, 23, 28, 35 and 40, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein the view page comprises a listing of a plurality of files (Figure 6 of Khan shows a listing of files in a hierarchical tree display).

Referring to claims 6, 16, 24, 29 and 41, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein the listing of files is sorted (as seen from the left-hand side of Figure 6 of Khan, the listing of files is sorted alphabetically).

Referring to claims 7 and 36, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein the application is a word processor or spreadsheet (the productivity application displays a spreadsheet) (Ferguson: page 2, paragraphs 0013-0014 and Figures 11A-11B).

Referring to claim 8, Ferguson, as modified, teach upon the element having been processed, receiving and displaying a new web view page (rendering, or displaying a web page that changes in response to user actions) (Ferguson: page 17, paragraphs 0175-0177).

Referring to claim 9, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein being processed by the browser module comprises executing a separate program to display content (providing capabilities through a specific, separate application program; furthermore, users can choose to download only browser-based views of the application) (Ferguson: page 6, paragraph 0062 and page 14, paragraph 146).

Referring to claim 12, Ferguson, as modified, teach confirming that the computing resource recognizes an application program function attribute in a request to the computing resource to generate a Web view page (data requests are sent in the form of queries which will return the appropriate results) (Ferguson: page 20, paragraphs 208-209 and Figure 16D).

Referring to claims 15, 30 and 42, Ferguson, as modified, teach the server responding to a request resulting from a user having selected an element of the web page view (users interact with the spreadsheet application, i.e. select information, etc.; for example, when users click on certain buttons such as the Alert Wizard button 1142 in Figure 11B, the server will send appropriate alerts and notifications) (Ferguson: page 16, paragraph 0166).

Referring to claim 17, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein responding to a request comprises sending a new web page view to be displayed within the application dialog box (the display of web pages are changed in response to user actions) (Ferguson: page 17, paragraphs 0175-0177).

Referring to claim 18, Ferguson, as modified, teach wherein the response from the server comprises a new web view page to be displayed by the application (the display of web pages are changed in response to user actions; for example, user selection of different components, or changes in user queries will result in different network content, i.e. new web pages to be displayed on the productivity application spreadsheet) (Ferguson: page 17, paragraphs 0175-0177).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 1/2/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

5. The applicant argues that the cited combination fails to teach or suggest any embodiment in which a dialog object determines if a server supports a web view page for an application dialog box, and upon determining that the server supports a web view page for the dialog box, receives and displays a web view page from the server within the dialog box, and wherein upon receiving user input corresponding to an element in a web view, determines if the element is to be processed by a browser module and, if so, processes the element by the browser module, or, if not, passes appropriate information about the element to the dialog box. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ferguson teaches that data requests are sent in the form of queries to the server and the server will return the determined supported web page views, i.e. network/Internet content that match the query parameters to the client display (page 20, paragraphs 0208-0209); furthermore, the spreadsheet display of Ferguson contains browser based functionalities and

Art Unit: 2173

regular application functionalities. Therefore, if the user selects a button such as the Alert Wizard button 1142 in Figure 11B, the browser, i.e. network/Internet module will send appropriate alerts and notifications; if the user selects common desktop application functions, the desktop application will process the selection. Khan teaches dialog boxes that provide HTML, i.e. web functionalities (page 4, claim 1). Therefore, the examiner respectfully argues that the combination of Ferguson and Khan teaches the subject limitations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100